

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Mayo during the September 23 personal interview. The points discussed are incorporated into the following remarks, and constitutes Applicant's summary of the interview.

**I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

**A. AOAPA in view of Morgan**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Applicant's Own Admission of Prior Art ("AOAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,473,117 to Morgan et al. ("Morgan"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The AOAPA does not teach or suggest a shielded wire harness including a shielding member having "a main shield portion made of a substantially rigid metal pipe," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action admits that the AOAPA does not teach or suggest a shielding member formed in the tube shape, configured to enclose a plurality of wires collectively, connected to a shield case, including a main shield portion made of metal pipe, and including a sub-shield portion. However, the Office Action asserts that Morgan remedies the deficiencies of the AOAPA. Notwithstanding these assertions, Morgan does not remedy the deficiencies of the AOAPA. Specifically, Morgan does not teach or suggest a main shield portion made of a substantially rigid metal pipe, as set forth in claim 1.

During the personal interview, Applicant's representative asserted that Morgan does not teach or suggest a shielded wire harness including a shielding member having a main shield portion made of a metal pipe. However, the Examiner asserted that Webster's

dictionary defines the term "pipe" as a hollow cylinder or tube of material. Therefore, the Examiner asserted that the metal sheaths/foil shieldings 14, 16 of Morgan are formed as hollow cylinders or tubes of material which constitutes metallic pipes. See Figs. 1-3.

While Applicant respectfully disagrees that the foil shielding of Morgan can reasonably be considered to be a metal pipe, Applicant amends claim 1 to recite "a substantially rigid metal pipe" to clarify this feature and advance prosecution. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are not narrowed by such amendment because a person skilled in the art would have understood a metal pipe as claimed to be substantially rigid. In other words, a person skilled in the art would understand the difference between a metal pipe as claimed and a foil sheath as disclosed by Morgan. Thus, the claims are not narrowed since such amendment only makes explicit that which a reasonable interpretation of the original claim language would have required.

Morgan teaches a cable 10 have a plurality of conductors 18 collectively enclosed by a foil inner shield 16 and a foil outer shield 14 folded around an external shape of a bundle of the conductors 18. See col. 2, line 67 - col. 3, line 8. See Figs. 1 and 2. Morgan also teaches that the outer shield 14 is cut and folded back to expose a conductive inner surface to provide electrical contact with the ground strap assembly 24. See col. 3, lines 31-47, and Fig. 2. Further, both the outer shield 14 and the inner shield 16 consist of foil shielding of the type widely used in the electronic industry for cable shielding. See col. 3, lines 4-6.

Further, Morgan discloses that by bending the large cable 10 to form a curve with a tight radius, the shielding materials 14, 16 surrounding the conductors 18 often tear. See col. 1, lines 16-18. Therefore, the outer shield 14 and the inner shield 16 are thin, flexible pieces of material that can be easily torn or deformed. Thus, neither of the thin foil outer and inner shields 14, 16 can reasonably be considered to be a substantially rigid metal pipe as set forth in claim 1.

The shielded wire harness of claim 1 includes a tube-shaped shielding member 50 having a sub-shield portion 53 and a main shield portion 51. See Figs 1 and 2. Since the main shield portion 51 is made of a substantially rigid metal pipe, the main shield portion 51 electromagnetically shields and physically protects the wires 30 from external forces. See application page 13, lines 2-10. Such results cannot be achieved by combining the devices of the AOAPA and Morgan. For at least these reasons, and the reasons previously set forth in the September 15 Amendment, Morgan, like the AOAPA, does not teach or suggest a main shield portion made of a substantially rigid metal pipe.

Therefore, claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by the AOAPA in view of Morgan. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1, and thus also would not have been rendered obvious by the AOAPA in view of Morgan. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**B. The AOAPA in view of Morgan, and further in view of Lawson**

The Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the AOAPA in view of Morgan, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,280,246 to Lawson et al. ("Lawson").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As discussed above, neither the AOAPA nor Morgan, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a shielded wire harness including a shielding member having "a main shield portion made of a rigid metal pipe," as recited in claim 1. Lawson does not remedy the deficiencies of the AOAPA and Morgan.

Lawson is directed to a ground shield connector 10 including a tinned soft copper compression ring 20 fitted over a tinned brass collector ring 18 to hold all end portions 26 of metallic shieldings (braided portions) of each wire conductor 12. See Figs. 2 and 4, and col. 2, line 56 – col. 3, line 40. Lawson does not teach or suggest that the compression ring 20 or the collector ring 18 is a substantially rigid metal pipe that electromagnetically shields

the conductors 12. For at least these reasons, and the reasons previously set forth in the September 15 Amendment, Lawson, like the AOAPA and Morgan, does not teach or suggest a main shield portion made of a substantially rigid metal pipe.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and thus would not have been rendered obvious by the AOAPA in view of Morgan, and further in view of Lawson. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Moore  
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNM/kzb

Date: October 8, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**  
Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461